

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found at least at page 3, line 30; page 4, lines 5-7 and page 4, lines 11-13. No new matter has been added. Applicant believes that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

I. Interview with the Examiner

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of extending an interview on July 14, 2009. During the interview, the Applicant's representative argued that pending claim 1 defines over the cited MATLAB reference. Specifically, Applicant's representative explained that in the present application, components of the graphical model representation are associated with the corresponding portions of the generated report such that when a user selects a component in the graphical model, corresponding portion of the report is displayed to the user. The Examiner suggested amending the claims to better define how the associations are created and what is achieved by the associations. The Examiner also suggested positively claiming that the report is generated before selecting a graphical object from the graphical model representation. The Examiner indicated that he believes the language of the pending claims is broad and needs to be amended to further define the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant amends claims in light of the Examiner's suggestions.

During the interview, the Examiner inquired about the improvements provided by the present application over the MATLAB reference. In response to the Examiner's inquiry, Applicant respectfully submits that, as recited in pending claim 1, the present application associates portions of the produced report with corresponding one or more graphical objects of the graphical model. As such, it is possible to navigate the produced report from the graphical model representation. Using the graphical model representation as a navigation tool for a report is an alternative to browsing a structural index of the report or performing some type of text search on the report. Both of these techniques, i.e. browsing a structural index of the report or performing some type of text search on the report, are tedious by comparison and hence, less

efficient and prone to mistakes. The pending claims allow the user to scan through a familiar graphical representation of a design, i.e. the graphical model representation, and quickly access desired information (Present Application, page 5, lines 1-5). Applicant believes that the foregoing remarks address the Examiner's concerns.

II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by "MATLAB Report Generator" by Mathworks, Inc (hereafter "MATLAB reference").

A. Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A computer-implemented method comprising:

 performing, using the computer, an analysis or synthesis operation on a graphical model representation that includes at least one graphical object;

 producing, using the computer, a report from the analysis or synthesis operation;

 generating, using the computer, one or more tags for one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report;

associating, using the computer, the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report;

associating, using the computer, the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object;

 completing, using the computer, production of the report;

receiving, using the computer, a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and

displaying, using the computer, a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device.

The MATLAB reference does not disclose **associating, using the computer, the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while**

producing the report, associating, using the computer, the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object; receiving, using the computer, a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and displaying, using the computer, a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device, as recited in Applicant's amended claim 1.

The MATLAB reference discusses a report generator that can take any information from the MATLAB workspace and export it to a document in the form of a report. The reports generated with the report generator can include figures, data, variables and functions from the models or M-files, as well as snapshots of system graphics and figures (The MATLAB reference, page 10, Chapter 1). That is, in the MATLAB reference, the report is merely created by cutting portions of the graphical model or the M-file and pasting them in a document.

The Examiner asserts that the MATLAB reference discloses *associating one or more tags with a graphical object in the graphical model representation*, as recited in Applicant's claim 1 (Office Action, page 3).

However, the section of the MATLAB reference cited by the Examiner merely discusses associating tags with the figures that are imported from the modeling environment into the report (the MATLAB reference, page 25). That is, the MATLAB reference discusses associating graphical objects *of the report* with tags. The MATLAB reference uses tags to name the figures imported in the report.

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 recites *associating one or more tags with a graphical object in the graphical model representation*. The figures of the MATLAB reference are not in the graphical model representation. The MATLAB reference is silent about **associating, using the computer, the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report**, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Moreover, the MATLAB reference fails to disclose **associating, using the computer, the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report**, as further recited in Applicant's claim 1. As provided above, the MATLAB reference is silent about *associating the one or more tags with the one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation*. Since the MATLAB reference does not disclose associating tags with the graphical objects of the graphical model, the MATLAB reference cannot disclose **associating, using the computer, the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report**.

Applicants amend claim 1 to further clarify what is meant by *associating*. Amended claim 1 recites that **associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object**. That is, in the present application, there is a connection between the graphical object of the graphical model representation and the corresponding sections of the report. That is why, it is possible for the present application to **display a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device upon receiving a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report**, as provided in Applicant's claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the MATLAB reference does not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

B. Claims 2-5 and 7-11

Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly claims 2-5 and 7-11 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

C. Claims 12-19 and 21-23

Independent claims 12 and 23 recite similar features to claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 12 recites **means for associating the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report; means for associating the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object; means for receiving a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and means for displaying a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device.**

Independent claim 23 recites **associate the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report; associate the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object; receive a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and display a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device.**

In light of the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the MATLAB reference does not disclose each and every element of claims 12 and 23. Claims 13-19 and 21-22 depend from independent claim 12 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 12. Accordingly claims 13-19 and 21-22 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the MATLAB reference in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,015,911 to Shaughnessy et al (hereafter “Shaughnessy”).

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 12 and, as such, incorporates all of the elements of claim 12.

The Examiner cites Shaughnessy for the teaching of generating a report in PDF format. Shaughnessy merely concerns providing a graphical representation of data gathered from various databases. Shaughnessy generally discusses generating a report from a plurality of data sources. A data source specification indicates the data to be retrieved from the data sources so that the report may be generated based upon the extracted data. A view specification indicates how the data is to be visually represented within the report (Abstract). However, Shaughnessy is silent about a graphical model representation having one or more graphical objects. Specifically, Shaughnessy, alone or in any reasonable combination with the MATLAB reference, does not disclose or suggest **means for associating the one or more tags with one or more graphical objects of the graphical model representation while producing the report; means for associating the one or more tags associated with a graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates a selectable connection from the graphical object to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the graphical object; means for receiving a selection of a graphical object in the graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and means for displaying a location in the report corresponding to the selected graphical object in response to the selection on a display device**, as provided in Applicant’s claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-059RCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: July 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:/Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant